



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# MAKING CHRISTIANITY SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

## V. CHRISTIANITY AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

GERALD BIRNEY SMITH, D.D.

Professor of Christian Theology in the University of Chicago

Political democracy is a movement with a somewhat well-defined history. It is comparatively easy to trace the attitude of Christian thinking toward the experiments and theories which have developed into democratic forms of government. But industrial democracy has no such definite institutional form. It is an ideal making for industrial revolution. It is compelled to make headway against strong vested interests and is frequently tempted into movements of radicalism which complicate the ethical judgment of fair-minded men.

The fundamental question in industrial democracy is that of the control of the processes of industry and of the distribution of the profits of industry. Democracy means that those who administer the affairs of any organization shall receive their authority from popular consent instead of from a source removed from popular control. Democracy is not necessarily identical with welfare schemes, or with poor relief, or with improved housing and working conditions for laborers. All these benefits may be administered from above as an act of mercy, leaving workingmen helplessly dependent on the autocratic will of an employer. Democracy in industry means that the workers as well as the owners and managers of a business shall have a voice in the

decision of vital questions, exactly as democracy in government means that men are citizens with actual power to influence and control governmental policy rather than subjects whose only duty is obedience to the will of a superior. Ultimately it would subject the policies of capitalists and laborers alike to the social judgments of all the people, including consumers, as well as managers and workers.

### **I. The Ethics of Industry in a Class System**

A class system of society means that certain persons, because of birth or other circumstances, are privileged to enjoy immunity from hard or disagreeable labor. Such labor is performed for them by menials, who, likewise because of birth or other circumstances, may not aspire to escape from a life of toil. Originally such distinctions probably arose from the fact that a certain clan or tribe conquered another in war, and by virtue of superior force compelled the conquered group to labor on behalf of the conquerors. But the original sources of class distinctions are soon lost sight of, and social custom perpetuates the ideas of privileges and duties, interpreting them in terms of ethical conduct. The characteristic feature of a class system of ethical standards is that relations between the classes are so

shaped as to make the preservation of the dignity or honor of the upper class the supreme good. The habits and the morals of the lower classes must be fitted into this prior necessity. This means that the formulation of ethical duties is really in the hands of the upper class, and the moral condition of society is judged with reference to the respectability of the aristocracy, much as the character of a city today is usually judged by the appearances of the houses along the boulevards rather than by the conditions of the slums.

When the presuppositions of a class system are carried out in the realm of industry a member of the upper class, as a matter of course, determines the conditions of labor for those over whom he exercises authority. The slave has no rights of his own beyond certain rudimentary items, such as are recognized in the treatment of animals today. To starve or abuse a slave was, of course, a reflection on the character of the owner, exactly as ill treatment of a horse today arouses condemnation in right-minded men. But after all the horse is at the mercy of the driver. So was the slave at the mercy of the master. When slavery gave way, as it generally did in the Middle Ages, to a system of serfdom, there were certain generally accepted rules concerning the amount of labor which a villein must render to the lord of the manor. But villeins remained villeins and lords remained lords. Any advantage gained by the villeins had to make headway against a social system which took for granted the desirability of maintaining the privileges of the lords.

Where the control of conditions is kept in the hands of the upper classes

moral responsibility consists in a benevolent care on the part of masters for those dependent upon them. To treat slaves well was morally incumbent upon the owner. But all the benefits which he secured for them would consist simply in ameliorating their life as *slaves*. He was supposed to know what was good for them better than they could know. Whether they should be permitted to have an education or not and what the character of that education should be would be decided by the masters. The hours and conditions of labor would be determined by the humanitarian sensitiveness of the master. The slave might be exceedingly comfortable and well cared for under a good master, but his comfort was dependent on the goodwill of the master or on the conventions of the master-class. Paternal solicitude on the part of the master was the highest virtue, while on the part of a slave personal loyalty to the master was expected. This essentially aristocratic relationship produced certain very beautiful virtues and gave rise to a type of personal affection which has many fine traits. It makes possible the application of the analogy of family life in the solution of ethical problems, with the suggestion of intimate and interested love between parent and child. But it contemplates the perpetual minority of the slave.

This same paternalistic ethics was to a large extent carried over when slavery gave way to the relationship between employer and employee. To make possible a certain amount of comfort *within the limitations of the standards of living thought proper for the laboring class* was always urged as an ethical

duty. But that there were permanent limitations to the rightful aspirations of the lower classes was taken for granted. The humbler man must quietly accept these limitations and display in them a spirit of fidelity and loyalty to his industrial master. If it chanced that the wage standards were insufficient to provide reasonable comfort, and the master or society benevolently chose to make up the deficiency by charity, the recipient was expected to accept the situation in a grateful spirit.

## II. Christian Ethics in a Class System

In these modern times of industrial revolution there have been many attempts to prove that Christianity was from the beginning opposed to the social system which makes possible class distinctions. But an honest reading of Christian literature will convince one that it is vain to seek here for revolutionary ideals in the organization of industry. In general Christianity has taken for granted the existing industrial order and has interpreted life in terms of a deepened sense of moral responsibility within the limits of this order. The New Testament speaks of slaves as it speaks of Gentiles. Both are types of people actually existing. The task of the Christian apostle or teacher is not to abolish slavery nor to do away with the Gentiles. It is rather to make possible for slave and for Gentile as truly as for freeman or for Jew a religious experience which shall give abundant spiritual life to the individual. *Religiously* there is to be no distinction between Jew and Gentile, or between bond and free. But the possession of this religious life

will express itself in an enhanced sensitiveness to the duties already recognized in the best interpretations of a paternalistic social system. How naturally Jesus speaks of masters and servants, exactly as he does of phenomena of nature! "Servants, be obedient to them that according to the flesh are your masters, with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as unto Christ," says the apostle. The slave Philemon was returned to his master by Paul, not to be freed, but to be treated as a Christian brother. To introduce personal relations of love into the existing system was the aim of primitive Christianity, not to disrupt conventional relationships.

Moreover, in the simple industrial conditions amid which the early Christians lived there were no such complicated problems of industrial organization as have arisen in modern times. Production of goods was well standardized, because there was little or no change of methods of manufacture or agriculture from age to age. Thus popular common sense could judge of the equity of prices and wages as it cannot today, when these are hidden behind the books of large corporations. The early Christians were concerned not with the ethics of production but rather with the matter of the distribution of wealth in a spirit of love. Thus we find little or no criticism of economic theories. The important thing is that individuals who in the existing order have a superfluity of wealth shall be ever ready to help their less fortunate brethren. Almsgiving is a prominent virtue in Christian ethics, both in early and in mediaeval times. But one looks in vain for any social

agitation which would aim so to redistribute economic opportunity and resources as to make almsgiving unnecessary. This latter ideal is a distinctly modern product. Poverty has been regarded in Christian teaching as something inevitable. "The poor ye have always with you." Poverty is to be met by the benevolence of well-to-do people rather than by industrial reorganization.

In the early days of Christian history the expectation was widely prevalent that the end of the world was soon to come, when all existing institutions would be swept away and the ground cleared for the Kingdom of God, in which perfect brotherly love would reign amid physical conditions so altered as to remove the evils from which men now suffer. To attain so pure a character that God would include one in the membership of the coming kingdom was the Christian's supreme duty and privilege. That this character would find expression in helpful attitudes toward other men was, of course, true. Left to itself it would tend to humanize industrial conditions; but attention was directed to individual purity of life rather than to agitation for the overturn of existing customs. To withdraw from occupations fraught with immoral consequences, such as manufacture of idols, or employment in demoralizing baths or amusements, and to order one's life solely in relation to the demands of the Kingdom of God, regardless of economic consequences, would be a Christian duty. But at a time when no one thought in terms of industrial democracy, why should we expect to

find the ideal in early Christian literature?

As time went on the emphasis on a purely spiritual life found expression in monasticism, which, by fostering the ideal of withdrawal from the world, tended to depreciate a too-active interest in the business of the world. Tertullian, in one of his exhortations to Christians, distinctly eliminates all concern for industrial welfare from the thought of a true Christian. Says he:

Is trade adapted for a servant of God? But, apart from covetousness, what is the motive for acquiring? When the motive for acquiring ceases, there will be no necessity for trading. . . . Do you hesitate about arts and trades, and about professions likewise for the sake of children and parents? Even there [in the Gospels] was it demonstrated to us that both dear relations and handicrafts and trades are to be left behind for the Lord's sake: While James and John, called by the Lord, do leave quite behind both father and ship; while Matthew is roused up from the toll-booth; while even burying a father was too tardy a business for faith. None of those whom the Lord chose to him said, "I have no means to live." Faith fears no famine.<sup>1</sup>

The general Christian attitude toward worldly occupations and activities is well expressed in Augustine's principle that the Christian should *use* the world but should not *enjoy* the world.<sup>2</sup> Nothing is to be valued for its own sake, but only as it can contribute to making life acceptable to God. This principle introduces a theological standard for the estimation of worldly pursuits.

Such a way of thinking about industrial life has its bad as well as its good side. It is certainly necessary, if we

<sup>1</sup> *De dol.* 11, 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Utendum est mundo, non fruendum.*—*De doctrina christ.* i. 3.

are to have any morality in business at all, that industrial interests shall not be permitted to pass final judgment on human relations. This always means the sacrifice of human values to the mere technique of financial profit. That business should be transacted for the glory of God is far better than that it should be transacted for the enhancement of Mammon. But with all its idealism this theological way of judging business ethics is not at all adapted to introduce democratic principles into business ethics; for moral requirements are brought to business from a source lying outside industry instead of being developed out of the experienced activities of business itself. A theological regulation of industry is an instance of overhead control rather than of democratic development. It is largely the retention and the cultivation of this outsider's point of view which have been responsible for the failure of industrial development to take more seriously the admonitions of Christian teachers. If the church, without entering at all into the activities of business life, may nevertheless legislate for the business man, why is it not equally ethical for the capitalist or the manager of big business to legislate for the workers without actually entering into the exigencies of their life?

The practical application of this principle of Augustine's is the familiar Christian doctrine of *stewardship*. The Christian must administer his possessions or his business as a trust from God. As was pointed out in a previous article, Christian thinking for centuries explained everything by reference to theological decrees. God originally

created the world in such a way that it would yield only good. In this original creation all the goods of the world were freely accessible to all, as the air and sunlight are open to all today. But after man sinned greed and covetousness reigned, and some individuals began to monopolize the treasures of earth and to shut out their less aggressive brethren. Hence for the restraint of evil certain positive regulations have been enacted. In this way laws of property and of industrial regulation exist for the restraint of evil. The justification of any law is to be found ultimately in its competency to secure the effectual restraint of evil in society.

But the source of all authority is God. Human laws have validity only as they derive their authority from God. In a previous article we saw that Catholicism objects to the theory underlying modern democracy because according to this theory men take into their own hands the constructing of government instead of seeking the divine authority for their political endeavors. The regulation of industrial relationships, according to this position, can be effective only as those who exercise authority act as representatives of God's will. This is the real meaning of the doctrine of stewardship. The property-owner has his possessions by the consent of God, as it were. His retention of his property is morally justified only as he administers his possessions in accordance with the divine will.

This doctrine of stewardship introduces a powerful influence for good into an autocratic industrial system. If by existing custom a master has absolute

authority over a slave the most effective way in which to secure a humanitarian treatment of slaves is to remind the master that he is answerable to God for his behavior toward a fellow-man. If by common consent society is divided into two classes, one possessing property privileges and the other dependent on the owners and landlords for a livelihood, to urge the property-owners to consider themselves stewards of a God-given responsibility is an effective challenge to any policy of mercenary exploitation. In inculcating this doctrine of stewardship the Christian church has exerted a great influence for social righteousness.

From the point of view of a democratic organization of society, however, the doctrine of stewardship is seriously defective. Stewardship to whom? To God, of course. But suppose an employer does not behave as the employees believe he should. Who is to decide whether the employer is right in his conception of stewardship? Evidently a theological stewardship is to be judged by theological experts. The control of the situation is thus kept out of the hands of the laboring classes. If they attempt to enforce their desires by strikes or by other attempted coercion they are almost inevitably regarded as lawless; for instead of quietly waiting for the steward to get his instructions from above they insist on obtruding their own ideas of regulation. From the point of view of the laboring-man the doctrine of theological stewardship is open to the same objection as the doctrine of the divine rights of a king. In neither case is there opportunity for democratic control.

### III. The Development of the Modern Industrial World

In order to appreciate the problem of modern industrial justice we should have in mind certain important developments which have made antiquated the mediaeval way of viewing industrial problems. The foundation of mediaeval social thinking was the doctrine that God had appointed definite laws for the regulation of human relations. Since the conditions of life were relatively stable it was natural to conceive existing classes and relationships as the permanent expression of a divinely willed order. Efforts at achieving justice would consist in ascertaining the divine will as expressed either in the "law of nature" or in the more definite revelation intrusted to the church.

Catholic teachers constantly refer to the Protestant Reformation as the beginning of the dissolution of the system of reverence for divine authority. When this reverence is gone men will inevitably revert to selfishness. The industrial unrest of the modern world is thus explained by Catholics as an inevitable consequence of the movement toward license initiated by the Lutheran revolt.

But industrial development has been shaped by events far more important than the Lutheran Reformation. Before Luther posted his theses the discovery of America occurred, and the lure of exploration was quite as important a theme of thought for the next two or three centuries as were the doctrinal novelties of Luther. The significance of the discovery of the new continent was tremendous. *Here was a new world not organized in subjection to the Catholic*

*church.* The motives which led men to the new realm were varied, being often religious, though frequently purely economic. But whatever might be the religious presuppositions with which men came, the fact was that they had the opportunity to shape conditions of living according to their liking. Human experiment was a more evident fact than divine legislation. The possibilities of migration to the New World gave ambitious men a chance to alter their status by their own activity. It is scarcely possible to overestimate the influence of this mobilization of opportunity on the ways of thinking current in the Old World. America has been largely responsible for the vanishing of the "old-fashioned servant"; for with the opportunities of America before them men did not need to remain in the status where the accident of birth had placed them. When by crossing the sea a man could carve his own career he would not listen with much patience to a gospel of stewardship which would bid him be content where he was.

The most important historical factor, however, is the Industrial Revolution, by which the older conditions of hand manufacture and local markets were replaced by the tremendous production made possible by power machinery, and by the consequent eager development of world-wide markets in which to dispose of the products of factories. Large-scale industry supplanted the smaller enterprises and did away with the personal relationships between master and employee, which made the doctrine of stewardship practicable.

Certain features of modern large-scale production must be kept in mind in

order to appreciate the problem of introducing humanitarian relationships. In the first place immense sums of capital are needed to build modern plants. These sums are secured by inducing people who have saved money to purchase shares of stock. In a technical sense a stockowner becomes part owner of the business. But his investment is not made usually because of any real interest in the business. Whether it is a gold mine or a new breakfast food is a matter of indifference. The only question raised is whether the investment will pay a big profit; 10 per cent is better than 6, even if the larger profit is made from an enterprise of doubtful ethical quality. In the second place, the running of the enterprise is placed in the hands of managers who will be able to secure a good return on the capital invested. If the doctrine of stewardship is invoked at all (as it often is) the stewardship is to be rendered to the stockholders (who make their sentimental appeal pictured as of widows and orphans dependent on their dividends for their daily bread!). The factory manager is thus compelled to introduce methods which will secure a good profit on the money invested. Labor must be hired at as cheap a price as possible. If the laborers attempt by organization and collective bargaining to extort a higher wage the movement is called a "labor trouble." However much the manager may desire to do the right thing in his business, he is held securely by his responsibility to the investors.

The workingman thus finds himself employed by an enterprise organized in the interests of the investors. He calls



it a régime of capitalism. He asks by what right those who know nothing about the business, who never do a stroke of work in connection with it, who simply watch for the dividends on their stock, should receive more consideration than do the men who by the sweat of their brows and the giving of their time actually produce the goods. To invoke the doctrine of stewardship as a remedy seems futile in such a system; for stewardship has become so commercialized as to have lost the moral significance which it had in simpler industrial conditions.

These two events—the possibility of changing one's status by migration to a new world and the depersonalizing of industrial relationships by the development of capitalistic production—have created in working people a state of mind quite unlike that presupposed in the traditional theological system. They are no longer content to depend on the benevolent intentions of those above them (which may or may not exist), but they propose by their own activity to have some voice in determining just conditions of employment. This is as genuine a democratic movement as was the determination of citizens to have a voice in deciding upon the political conditions under which they should live instead of depending on the benevolent inclinations of a king. The trade union is an organization intended to oppose to the power of organized capital the power of a unified labor decision. As our fathers cried, "Taxation without representation is tyranny," so the trade union declares, "Wage determination without consultation with the wage-

earners is tyranny." Socialism would democratize industry by abolishing private ownership of productive property. If all industry is state-owned the citizens as voters may control industrial organization in democratic fashion. Bolshevism would abolish the existing States (which, it is claimed, are the tools of the capitalist class) and reorganize government on the basis of industrial groups rather than on the basis of geographical representation, so as to give the workers direct and complete control of all legislation. The important thing to bear in mind is that all these movements represent the doctrine of direct action on the part of working people to achieve for themselves what they regard as just. They embody an ineradicable distrust of any system which permits an "upper" class to legislate for them. This distrust, combined with the conviction that at present the control *is* given over to a privileged class, gives to their agitation a distinctly biased character, generally marked by a spirit of class warfare. But in insisting that stewardship shall be rendered to those who actually labor in an industry, in demanding a real voice in the operation of industry, they are voicing a democratic ideal. To deny them this right is possible only by retaining some form of autocracy in industry. The question may fairly be raised whether the unfortunate class exclusiveness of labor agitation is not largely due to the fact that society *has* been trying to continue certain privileges for non-workers and has been measuring values largely by the welfare of the privileged classes.

#### **IV. The Attitude of Christianity toward Modern Industrial Problems**

The movement for industrial democracy, while expressing itself in terms of right and justice, is nevertheless so different in content from the aims of the church that it is not to be expected that mutual understanding should be easy. The movement for industrial democracy is inevitably a class struggle. Those who feel that they are now suffering certain disabilities are agitating for larger rights and more extensive control. They make use of propaganda designed to intensify the existing feeling of injustice, and, like all movements for larger rights, resort to violence if their demands are stubbornly disregarded. The church, however, exists to promote the total spiritual welfare of men. It cannot minister to one class as contrasted with another. It naturally sees the evils of strife and seeks to induce peaceable methods of dealing with vexed problems. It thus instinctively holds aloof from the materialistic movements of industrial development, judging these in relation to the larger spiritual ends which it proclaims.

Moreover, Christian thinking has generally been shaped by the inheritance of the long centuries of ecclesiastical domination of culture. Christianity is conceived as a perfect system of truth resting on divine revelation. Thus possessing the truth *a priori*, the problem of reform is conceived as that of "applying" Christian principles. These principles are of course ascertained by study of the Bible and of the theological expositions provided for the purposes of religious education. But the convic-

tions of the workingman are wrought out of the actual experiences of industrial activity. They embody certain personal emotions which lend poignancy to the demand for reforms. By contrast the "Christian principles" expounded in the churches seem somewhat academic and vague.

Thus it has come about that Christianity in the past century has been more concerned with the theological correctness of the "principles" to be applied than with the concrete details of industrial development which have given rise to the agitation for industrial democracy. And, since labor agitations often, by the intensity of the convictions involved, bring about violence or secure ends by strikes which incommode the public and stir up ill feeling, the church has viewed the labor movement with some degree of suspicion.

Nevertheless Christianity has always been the champion of the oppressed and has insisted that the poor and the unfortunate shall not be utterly neglected. It is true that the traditional virtue of almsgiving has been most prominent; but in recent years there has been a rapidly increasing recognition of the fact that industrial reorganization is imperative if human justice is to be done.

The Catholic church has moved in this realm with a somewhat surer step than has Protestantism; for Catholicism is so conscious of its divine right as an organized church to instruct men in spiritual principles that it has no hesitation in uttering its doctrines regardless of whether these may or may not be popular. Moreover the Catholic ideal

of a Christian civilization is perfectly clear. As we have seen in previous articles Catholicism stands unpromisingly for the ideal of an ecclesiastically controlled culture. Only as men shall be governed by God's laws can there be any real human welfare.

This ecclesiastical consciousness leads Catholicism to oppose all organizations for agitation which rest on professedly secular principles. Exactly as in the case of political democracy Catholicism denounced a non-theological philosophy of government, so in the realm of industrial organization it denounces all non-theological social movements. Socialism is called by Pope Leo XIII a "plague" and a "pest."<sup>1</sup> He appeals to men to accept the authority of the Catholic church as the sole way of meeting the evils which confront us in modern society:

We lift up anew our Apostolic voice, and conjure men again and again for the sake of their own safety and that of the State to welcome and obey the teaching of that Church which has deserved so well in promoting the public prosperity of nations, and to recognize once for all that the relations of the State and of Religion are so bound together as that whatever is withdrawn from religion impairs by so much the dutiful submission of the subject and the dignity of authority. And when they shall have recognized that the Church of Christ is possessed of a power to stave off the pest of Socialism, too mighty to be found in human enactments or in the strong hand of the civil power or in military force, let them re-establish that Church in the condi-

tion and liberty needed in order to exercise her most salutary influence for the good of society in general.<sup>2</sup>

In other words, the Catholic ideal of a just society is that of a church-controlled culture. But such a society would be an autocracy, for the governing power is sanctioned from above. The particular kind of industrial organization advocated would depend on the theological conceptions of what is divinely ordained rather than on the demands of the people concerned. This spirit of docile obedience to constituted authority constantly appears in the practical injunctions to employers and employees. The doctrine of stewardship is reiterated in such a form as to suggest that one's financial condition is due to the will of God rather than to the man-made rules of the industrial game. "Whoever has received from the divine bounty a large share of temporal blessings . . . has received them for the purpose of using them for the perfection of his own nature, and, at the same time, that he may employ them, as the steward of God's providence, for the benefit of others."<sup>3</sup> Such stewardship will compel employers to recognize "that their work-people are not to be accounted their bondsmen; that in every man they must respect his dignity and worth as a man and as a Christian."<sup>4</sup> It will insist that employers shall pay "fair wages," shall provide for adequate leisure and opportunity for culture on the part of the workingmen, and shall be interested in securing conditions most

<sup>1</sup> Encyclical Letter, December 28, 1878, on "Socialism, Communism, and Nihilism."

<sup>2</sup> *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, pp. 31, 32.

<sup>3</sup> Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on "The Condition of the Working Classes," *op. cit.*, p. 222.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 219.

favorable to a spiritual life. But this amelioration of the condition of the working classes is to come through the installation of an ecclesiastical regulation of conduct rather than by a mere democratization of industry.

A recent statement published under Catholic auspices reads as follows:

The capitalist must likewise get a new viewpoint. He needs to learn the long-forgotten truth that wealth is stewardship, that profit-making is not the basic justification of business enterprise and that there are such things as fair profits, fair interest, and fair prices. Above and before all he must cultivate and strengthen within his mind the truth which many of his class have begun to grasp for the first time during the present war; namely that the laborer is a human being, not merely an instrument of production; and that the laborer's right to a decent livelihood is the first moral charge upon industry.<sup>1</sup>

The humanitarian emphasis of such a statement is a fine challenge to the profit-seeking spirit of our age. And so long as capitalists are in a position to take the initiative in business organization such exhortations are perhaps the best ethical counsel. Catholicism would look with favor on an increased voice of labor in industrial management, provided that the utterances of that voice are inspired by the teachings of the church. But a democracy which means the assertion of independence of church control could not be countenanced. Catholicism thus is far more insistent on a humanitarian attitude than on the technical installation of industrial democracy. It would advocate a

"Christian democracy," in which movements for social betterment shall proceed "with due regard to Episcopal authority and absolutely under Episcopal guidance."<sup>2</sup>

The attitude of Protestantism toward the problems arising out of modern industrial development has not been as self-consciously clear as has that of the Catholic church. The reasons for this are obvious if one considers the relations of the growing Protestant bodies to Catholicism and to the political powers. In defending their rights against Catholicism the Protestant churches from the first appealed to the Bible, and the Bible alone, as the sole divine authority. This tended to put out of mind the church traditions which form an integral part of Catholic theology, and thus to weaken the ideal, which Catholicism has never abandoned, of maintaining an ecclesiastical control over all the aspects of culture. Moreover, in so far as an interpretation of industrial duties was attempted, it would be derived from the Bible, which represents a very simple sort of industrial life. Protestant thinkers were so much concerned to vindicate and establish the rights of Protestant churches to exist, and to propagate their tenets, that doctrinal questions took foremost place in their efforts. So far as industrial problems were treated by the reformers at all the existing class system of industrial organization was taken for granted, and the virtues of benevolence on the part of employers and of personal loyalty on the part of servants were inculcated.

<sup>1</sup> *Reconstruction Pamphlet No. 1*, January, 1919. Published by the Committee on Special War Interests, National Catholic War Council.

<sup>2</sup> *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, p. 493.

Luther's exposition of the matter in his larger catechism is amusingly naïve to a modern reader. He is arguing, to be sure, that useful employment is a more religious activity than to be going on pilgrimages or seeking indulgences. But the religious excellence consists in a pious acceptance of a paternalistic authority of master over servant.

Therefore men and maids must see that they not only obey their masters and mistresses, but honor them as their own parents, and do all that they know they are expected to do, not with repugnance and because they are forced, but with pleasure and delight, simply for the reason already mentioned: that it is God's commandment and pleases Him above all other work. For this reason they ought to be willing even to make payment themselves and be glad that they can obtain masters and mistresses, and can have such a joyous conscience, and know that they can do real golden works. . . . Is it not a great thing to know this and to be able to say to thyself, If thou doest thy daily work, it is better than all the sanctity and strict discipline of the monks.

Imagine quoting the foregoing or the passage which follows as a means of solving modern industrial unrest:

Whoever is obedient, willing, and useful upon earth, and gladly does all that concerns his honor, knows that he is pleasing God, and will obtain joy and happiness as a reward. On the other hand, if he does not do this willingly, but despises this obedience, and sets himself against it, and rebels, he must know that he will receive neither mercy nor blessing.<sup>1</sup>

Another influence which has affected the Protestant attitude toward industrial questions has been the political doctrine of freedom which was so

effectually invoked by dissenters to guard the rights of conscience in matters of religion. It was easy to pass from the ideal of governmental non-interference in matters religious to an approval of the *laissez faire* conception of industry. If overhead regulation was bad in the realm of beliefs why was it not also bad in the realm of industry? It is significant that Catholic authorities link the two together as part and parcel of the same tendency to repudiate the authority of God. It is perhaps begging the question to remark that modern capitalism has developed its power in nations where Protestantism is the ruling religious force. But if Protestantism is not to be charged with inspiring capitalism it can scarcely be said to have interposed any serious moral objections to it. John Wesley's famous sermon is characteristic of Protestant opinion generally. Every Christian should, according to this sermon, (1) earn all he can, (2) save all he can, and (3) give away all he can in benevolence. To this day the consciences of Christian business men are far more developed in the direction of giving away money in charity than in asking concerning the justice of the way in which they were enabled to earn what they call their own to give away. It is to be noted that the prevalent applications of the doctrine of stewardship are concerned almost exclusively with the matter of giving away surplus wealth. The question as to the morality of the way in which the wealth was acquired is seldom raised. But the very crux of industrial democracy is the insistence that this latter matter shall be looked into.

<sup>1</sup> Luther's *Greater Catechism*. Exposition of the Fourth Commandment.

When, as was the case with a certain advertisement recently designed to enlist interest in Christian benevolence, one of the benefits conferred by the church on a community was stated to be that it tends to keep workingmen contented, a startling insensibility to the motives of the revolution impending in industry was indicated.

Nevertheless, one of the significant aspects of recent Protestant development has been a rapidly increasing interest in the industrial problem. A generation ago Washington Gladden was almost a unique figure in his radical treatment of social problems. Today there are scores of leading men in the various denominations who are whole-heartedly giving their best thought to problems of social reconstruction. Teachers like the late lamented Professor Walter Rauschenbusch have stimulated thousands to an earnest interest in the cause of industrial justice. The most feared "heresy" today is not theological. Few pastors need hesitate to preach radical theological doctrine, provided that it is evidently an interpretation of Christlike living. But economic heresy, anything that looks in the direction of "socialism," no matter how closely it may be linked up with Christian ideals, has to be handled with gloves in many communities; for it is not a pleasant thing for a wealthy pew-owner to have the question publicly raised as to whether the industrial organization which permitted him to amass his money is morally defensible. To contemplate a régime in which people are more concerned to know how a man made his money than to praise his gen-

erous gifts is not agreeable to one who has attained a comfortable status under the existing régime.

Steadily, however, with greater assurance and with increasing moral earnestness the Protestant churches are addressing themselves to the problem of industrial reconstruction. They have committed themselves frankly to the espousal of a program of fundamental changes rather than to a support of the existing order. It is to be expected that in the next few years the pronouncements of Christian bodies and the messages of Christian preachers will become more and more confident and will have more and more weight in shaping public opinion. A few citations from recent utterances will indicate how seriously the leaders in the churches are thinking concerning industrial democracy.

The development of Christianity in the church and the state requires industrial peace; but there can be no peace except Justice be realized. What is justice in industry can only be determined and maintained as it has been in government, *by the common consent of all concerned* [italics mine]. The teachings of Jesus give the common man the right to participate in the control of industry even as they give him the right to participate in the control of government. Therefore must the church support the measures that really make for industrial democracy. . . . The church must teach the principle of the fullest possible cooperative control and ownership of industry and of the natural resources upon which industry depends.<sup>1</sup>

At the annual meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention held at Denver,

<sup>1</sup> Pamphlet entitled *The Church and the Social Question*, issued by the Methodist Federation for Social Service.

Colorado, in May, 1919, the following resolutions were passed:

WHEREAS, We see as a result of modern industrial revolution, tendencies at work which produce an autocratic control of industry, which make wealth the end and human life the means, which divide men into opposing groups and de-personalize the relations between them, thereby creating conditions threatening social disintegration,

*Resolved*, That we reaffirm the sacredness of man, and demand that the industrial system in its processes, motives, and results be brought to the test of its contribution to human life and spiritual values.

*Resolved*, That we affirm our conviction that all parties in industry—investors, managers, workers, and the community—are partners, and that this calls for the creation of a constitution or charter for each industry, defining the terms and the conditions of labor, providing for redress of grievances on a basis of social justice, and insuring a progressive participation by all parties in knowledge of the enterprise, a voice in its direction, and an equitable sharing in the proceeds.

The most promising practical movement for the unification of Protestant forces in this country has been the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. From the first it has steadfastly refused to attempt any decision concerning doctrinal questions whereon evangelical denominations differ but has turned the entire energy of the organization toward co-operation in practical social endeavor. More and more clearly have the utterances of this representative body recognized the primary importance of the industrial problem in modern life. In a recent message entitled *The Church and Social*

*Reconstruction* the following statements occur:

A deep cause of unrest in industry is the denial to labor of a share in industrial management. Controversies over wages and hours never go to the root of the industrial problem. Democracy must be applied to the government of industry as well as to the government of the nation, and as rapidly and as far as the workers shall become able and willing to accept such responsibility. Laborers must be recognized as being entitled to as much consideration as employers, and their rights must be equally safeguarded. This may be accomplished by assuring the workers, as rapidly as it can be done with due considerations to conditions, a fair share in control, especially where they are directly involved; by opportunity for ownership, with corresponding representation; or by a combination of ownership and control in cooperative production.

The foregoing utterances might be multiplied many fold. All denominations are actively attempting to enable Christian convictions to speak in terms of modern conditions. It is evident that if the direction indicated by these utterances be followed we shall have the recognition that the theological doctrine of stewardship is insufficient. There must be distinct responsibility to the people concerned if industry is to be democratized. It will be no longer morally allowable for a man to view his fortune as providentially given to him so that he may exercise sovereign rights over its disposal. Such a view of the possession of property is too much like the doctrine that a king rules by the grace of God. The analogy between popular control of government and a similar popular control of industry is

being frankly set forth. If it was true that our nation could not continue to exist half slave and half free it is equally true that modern society cannot continue to exist with a régime of freedom and equality in political rights and a régime of subordination and arbitrary management in the realm of industry.

The sympathies of Christian leaders are with the growing movements of industrial democracy. But, as we have seen, our habits of religious thinking are inherited from an age when autocracy

was accepted as the rule of life. If Christianity is to be a genuine inspirer of democracy it must interpret life in terms of democratic processes rather than in terms of regulations imposed from overhead. The rapidity and the hearty good-will with which this is being undertaken are encouraging. But before the religious message of the church is thoroughly democratic certain emphases must become more pronounced. Some of these emphases we shall consider in a concluding article.

---

## CATHOLIC MODERNISM AND CATHOLIC DOGMA

---

JOHN T. McNEILL, D.B.  
Chicago, Illinois

---

Although the movement in the Roman Catholic church known as Modernism received its name in a Papal Encyclical of 1907, and officially perished with the issue of a Papal *Motu Proprio* of 1910, it can by no means be historically confined within these dates. The tendencies to which it gave tangible expression are in fact increasingly discernible in Roman Catholicism from the era of the French Revolution. It would be a mistaken description of Modernism that would connect it with twelfth- or sixteenth-century radicals like Abelard or Giordano Bruno. Such individualists are nearer to the spirit of liberal Protestantism, with its indifference to the idea of a Catholic church. The Modernists are essentially Catholic, and it is in the

name and spirit of Catholicism that they challenge the papacy. They are also essentially modern, as is shown in their respect for science, in their historic criticism, and in their democratic principles.

### **The Genesis of Modernism**

The Modernist spirit derives in some degree from the democratic revival of the French Revolution era. Revolution sentiment powerfully affected the church in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Early French Ultramontanism was possessed of the exhilarating hope of a democratized Catholicism. This liberal or modernizing tendency was represented by influential personalities like Montalembert and Lamennais. The latter, once a